



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Classical Philology

VOL. I

July, 1906

No. 3

THE ROMAN FRAGMENTS OF ATHENIAN COMIC DIDASCALIAE

BY EDWARD CAPPS

The problem of interpreting and restoring the three small fragments of the Greek didascalic inscription found in Rome (in 1777, 1765, and 1888) and last edited by Kaibel in *IG. XIV* (= *IGSI.*) 1097, 1098, 1098 *a* (Addenda, p. 697) is singularly fascinating to the student of Attic comedy. The great importance of the document to which they belonged is at once apparent, while the difficulties involved in the problem are baffling in the highest degree, on account both of the mutilated condition of the fragments and of the unusual nature of their contents. It is not surprising that no two of the scholars¹ who have discussed them, have until recently agreed in their interpretations. Doubtless many who have not committed their ideas to print have had the same experience as the present writer, who confesses to having spent many an odd hour over these 43 broken lines, convinced that the published interpretations were often wholly wrong, never wholly right, only to lay aside for further reflection his own incomplete restorations with numerous queries still unanswered.

But the problem has recently been brought appreciably nearer a solution by Alfred Körte in *Rhein. Mus.* LX (1905), pp. 425 ff.

¹ Böckh, Meineke, Usener, Bergk, Madvig, Petersen, Kaibel, and Wilamowitz. For the references see Körte or Kaibel. Wilamowitz' interpretation of 1098 is found only in the *Corpus*, communicated to the editor by letter.

In the first part of his study he builds largely upon the foundations laid by Petersen in *Wien. Stud.* VII (1885), pp. 181 ff. Even here, however, he makes several valuable contributions of his own, both by his restorations and especially by showing that the testimony of this inscription concerning the number of competing poets does not, as has been thought, contradict that furnished by the didascalical notices prefixed to the plays of Aristophanes. But the most valuable gain is in his positive identification of the poets of 1098*a* and the consequent proof that this fragment was a part of the document to which, as Petersen had shown, the other two fragments belonged. Körte's discovery supplies the most conclusive confirmation of the general results of Petersen.

While recognizing thus cordially the distinct value of Körte's article, both for our understanding of the document as a whole and for many details, I must express my dissent and attempt here to show that it is justified regarding one important point—the length of line. It may be that we shall never be able to reach agreement as to this vital factor in the restoration, although I personally think it can be determined; but it is quite as important that we shall not deceive ourselves into thinking that we have determined it when we have not. All restorations of this inscription from which new individual facts for the history of Attic comedy may be derived are absolutely dependent upon the accuracy with which the original line-length can be ascertained. We now know for a certainty that the item which still circulates in our handbooks, ἐπὶ Ἀντιοχίδου (434) Λύσιππος ἐνίκα, is wrong; but one who reads Körte's forceful article, with its claim of mathematical precision in the determination of the line-length, is likely to be led into an error which is still greater (for, though it rests upon a far better understanding of the inscription than Böckh possessed, it just happens to be farther from the truth), if he accepts as documentary the restoration of the record of this poet's first victory now proposed by Körte: Λύσιππος ἐνίκα μὲν Ἀθήναια ἐπὶ Γλαυκίππου (409) Καταχήναις. And this is especially true if, as might be inferred from Körte's words, Wilhelm is in agreement with him and intends to adopt in his forthcoming book

the same hypothesis. It has therefore seemed the more necessary to bring out without further delay the results of my own study of these fragments, formulated some years ago but withheld from publication by the momentary expectation of Wilhelm's book.¹ In view of the importance of Körte's article, and the fact that on the subject of the line-length he takes direct issue with the conclusions to which I have been led, a portion of this paper takes the form of an argument directed against him, in answer to his friendly but confident challenge (p. 431, and n. 1). But this incident to the presentation shall not lead me to forget his courtesy in communicating to me the results of his study two years ago nor the manifold instruction which I have derived from him.

Before we enter upon the discussion of the main question at issue it will be necessary to have before us the facts, on which doubtless all scholars now agree, concerning the purpose of the compiler of this document, the materials he employed, and his manner of arranging the items which enter into its construction.

The compiler of this document had set before himself the task of giving in full the agonistic history of each comic poet great and small who had competed in the two annual contests at Athens, doubtless from the first contest under state control, *ca.* 486. All the facts needed for such a record, except the occasional notes supplied by the catalogue of the Alexandrian library, were found ready to hand in the two sections of the comic didascaliae which Aristotle compiled and the state afterward brought down to date and published on stone.² These didascaliae gave in two lists, one for each festival, in chronological order by archons, the important facts in the history of the contests, chief among them being the archon-date and the title of the play of each competing poet in the order of the judge's award. Each rank except the first was introduced by the cardinal number abbreviated—*δευ. τρι. τε. πεμ.* From these didascaliae our compiler had first to collect the items pertaining to each poet separately. To do this he had

¹ Before 1903; see p. 25, n. 69 (on Aristomenes) of my *Introduction of Comedy into the City Dionysia*. My restoration has changed little since then, except for the addition of Körte's discoveries in 1098 *a* and that, convinced by his arguments, I have gone back to Anaxandrides as the principal poet in 1098.

² Lenaea: *IG.* II. 972, col. I; Dionysia: *IG.* II. 975.

merely to run through the Dionysian catalogue, jotting down the archon under whom the poet's name first appeared, the rank, and the play, and so on down until this poet's name ceased to recur; then through the Lenaeon didascaliae in the same way.

With the material for each poet assembled thus in two chronological series, the compiler's next task was to combine the Lenaeon with the Dionysian records in some orderly and perspicuous arrangement. The simplest would have been to adopt the plan of a single chronological group for each poet, simply adding the Dionysian items to the Lenaeon under the appropriate archons. Such an arrangement, however, would have had one obvious disadvantage from the point of view of the ancient student of the dramatic poets, who was especially interested to know the number of plays, the titles, the number of prizes won at the two festivals together and at the City Dionysia separately, the date of the first City victories, and possibly also of the first appearances. The compiler therefore chose the arrangement which would show such facts most clearly, grouping the firsts together, each festival apart, then the seconds, etc. Each rank-group was preceded by the appropriate caption (*ἐνίκᾳ*, *δεύτερος*, *τρίτος*, etc., later *β'*, *γ'* etc.), and each festival-group likewise (*ἐν ᾧσται*, *Λήναια*). The entries under each festival-group were arranged chronologically, and under each rank-group that festival-group was given first in which the poet had first been assigned to that rank. The festival-groups do not, therefore, succeed each other in a fixed order (as, e. g., *Λήναια—ἐν ᾧσται*, *Λήναια—ἐν ᾧσται*, etc.), but the first festival in a given rank-group may be the same as the last in the preceding rank-group. And here a fact is to be noted that is of great importance for the reconstruction of the document: Instead of repeating the festival-name in such cases, the compiler, to save space, gives simply the rank-caption without the festival.¹ When, therefore, we find the numeral without the festival, we must assume that the last preceding festival-group

¹ Körte often disregards this factor (e. g., 1097, ll. 11, 12, 13, and elsewhere), probably because he does not believe in it. But the *ε* in 1097, l. 6, can be interpreted in no other way and it would be, in my opinion, unsafe to reject the clue thus given. But it is difficult to apply the principle if we take so short a line as Körte does. The principle is fully recognized by Petersen, p. 185.

was of the same festival, and conversely, when the festival is given with the numeral, the other festival preceded.

From this arrangement, which might result in ten festival-groups in each poet's record, we deduce two observations: The first item in one, and generally not the first, of the rank-groups gave the date of the poet's first appearance; and the first item in the second festival-group under each rank-group would always be later than the first item in the preceding festival-group. But there can naturally be no chronological relation whatever between the first items of the main rank-groups. It is logically quite conceivable, though not likely to occur, that the first item in a particular rank-group would fall at a later date than the last item in the preceding rank-group. Consistently with the greatest possible order and system in the method of arrangement we might have, on any fragment, a set of items that seem wholly irregular, and at the same time, on another, the appearance of a chronological order when the items really belong to different chronological groups; see below, p. 208. And such deceptions would naturally be more likely to occur if the line were long than if it were short.

The compiler was obliged to decide, further, whether the poets should be arranged alphabetically or chronologically. The first plan was far simpler to follow. But the advantage of having contemporary poets in the same neighborhood on the stone, and the distortion of literary history which would have resulted if, for example, Cratinus was followed by Crito and Antiphanes by Apollodorus, led to the adoption of the chronological order. But how was the chronology of each poet to be determined? The order of first victories, conveniently furnished by the victors' lists *IG. II. 977*, would leave out the poets who had won no victories. The only practicable method was to allow the position of the poet to be fixed by the earliest mention of him in the didascaliae, i. e., by the date of his first appearance.¹ This was certainly the method followed.

Recognizing, therefore, the factors which determined the

¹ Cf. the comment on the tragic poet Aphareus, *Vit. X. Orat.* 839 d: ἀρξάμενος δ' ἀπὸ Λυσιστράτου διδάσκειν, ἄχρι Σωσιγένους, ἐν ἔτεσιν εἰκοσιοκτώ, etc. This principle also was recognized by Petersen.

position of a poet in this document and the disposition of the agonistic items in the record of each, it is obviously of the greatest importance to bring to bear upon the interpretation of the scanty remains all available sources of information which furnish us with definite chronological data concerning the contests of all the comic poets whose activities fall within the period touched by these fragments. Foremost in importance among such sources must be reckoned the two victors' lists, *IG. 977 i, k* (City) and *d, e, f, g, h* (Lenaean). The order of names in these lists would naturally be different at many points from that of our document, for it is determined by the dates of first victories; nor would these lists include all the names in our document. Again the order of names in the Lenaean list differs materially from that in the Dionysian. But in spite of these drawbacks, with the few definite data which we possess it is possible to fix approximately the date at which a poet who occupies a given position in these lists won his first victory. If our document, therefore, furnishes us with an outline of the career of a poet whose name is lost, the victors' lists may help, with the extant titles, to identify the poet. And if the document gives a poet's name with the fact that he was victorious, the victors' lists may give us light on the festival; or, more important, by furnishing us with the approximate date of his first victory, may prevent our adopting a false reconstruction of the inscription, even if it does not actually identify his name.

If the document covered the whole period of Attic comedy, a period of *ca.* 300 years, it must have been of imposing proportions. Except for twenty years or so during the Peloponnesian War there were ten entries for each year. Obviously it was incumbent upon the compiler to save space where possible. We observe efforts in this direction: After about the twenty-fifth poet he abandons the ordinal spelled out in favor of the numeral sign; he omits the festival name where confusion would not arise from so doing; and he is sparing of blank spaces before the leading categories. But the effort is most noticeable in his failure to adopt the most perspicuous disposition of his material on the stone, *viz.*, to give to each entry and heading a separate line (as in *IG. II. 971*) or at least to begin every new main category at the

beginning of a line. When he decided to run poets, captions, and entries into solid lines with sparing use of spaces he at once sacrificed perspicuity to considerations of economy. Having sacrificed so much, and with so great a mass of material to dispose of, is it likely that he would have rendered his work still less usable with no corresponding gain in space by adopting a narrow column of about one entry to a line? In such a column almost every entry would be broken between lines and the proportion of broken words would be very large. On general principles, therefore, one would expect to find a line considerably longer than that proposed by Körte.

Körte, with Petersen, decides upon 28-32 as the normal number of letters to a line, but he claims for this hypothesis a degree of certainty which Petersen carefully refrained from doing.¹ Körte's criteria are as follows: (1) In two successive lines (5, 6) of 1098 occur two archons of successive years, Charisandrus 375, Hippodamas 374. The inference is drawn that the latter was the next entry after the former in the original record. (2) Accepting this inference as a working basis, the lacunae can be filled out with hypothetical entries which satisfy the space conditions, in such a way as to connect the broken ends of lines with the next broken beginnings. In other words, a complete record can be made on the assumption of *ca.* 30 letters, the least possible number. In reply it may be said that the same might be done with lines averaging longer by one entry, as Petersen showed. But if, by evidence derived from outside the inscription, it can be shown that the reconstruction with the short line runs counter to known facts, it will be clear that the inference based upon the two archons is erroneous.

After setting up these positive criteria, Körte makes an appeal on the basis of certain coincidences which will be interfered with if a longer line is assumed. In five successive lines of 1098 (see below, p. 220) we chance to have the archons of 382, 375, 374, 365, and 349, while in the line above the first date is the festival heading *ἐν ἄσσει* and after the latest date *Λήναια*. Now if a longer line were taken, *Λήναια* would have to be inserted between

¹ *Wien. Stud.* XII (1885), p. 189.

375 and 374, and *ἐν ἄσσει* would accordingly be required between 365 and 349, so that, instead of a single series, we should have three, viz. (supplying the missing dates hypothetically): *γ' ἐν ἄσσει* **385**, 382, **378**, 375; *γ' Ἀθήναια* **377**, 374, **371**, **368**, 365; *δ' ἐν ἄσσει* **370**, 349. Apropos of such a reconstruction Körte (p. 431) vehemently protests, exclaiming that thus (1) 'precisely the second Lenaeon exhibition of the third class would be one year behind the last Dionysian.' I see no earthly reason why it should not have been. (2) 'The beginning of the list of City fourths would fall in the lacuna.' But when at least half of the width is lost one may reasonably expect to find at least half of the data missing. Körte himself is obliged to supply the festival twice in two successive lines in 1087. (3) 'The extant titles of the fourth class would follow chronologically upon the last Lenaeon exhibition of the third class, so that, in the fragment, the remains of the City thirds, Lenaeon thirds, and City fourths create the illusory appearance of a continuous chronological series.' The answer to the last objection is given above (p. 205). The easiest and most natural thing in the world would be to accept without further consideration these particular five lines as giving the original order of items. But when we observe that in this same fragment the four lines 10-13 also seem to give a compact group of dates (367, 364, 356, 352), but that the sequence is broken by the *ἐν ἄσσει* on the stone itself and that Körte is obliged to break it a second time, we are warned to proceed cautiously. In fact, if we chanced to have the other half of the five lines to which Körte appeals, the original line having been about twice as long, it would contain six dates (the bold-face type above) of which the first five, though belonging to different chronological groups, would happen to be in sequence!

In short, this dictum may be laid down: Whatever hypothesis may be advanced regarding the original length of line on the basis of coincidences or other apparent indications offered by the fragments themselves, it can not be accepted forthwith as certain, but requires confirmation by means of pertinent evidence derived from outside sources before it can be regarded as the true basis of restoration.

It is possible to apply the test of external evidence to Körte's hypothesis in 1097, where the joining of l. 7 to l. 8 gives the statement that Lysippus was victorious in 410 (or 409) at the Lenaea, or possibly *ἐν ἄστει*. Now the name of Lysippus is not preserved on either of the victors' lists; it must therefore have been in one of the present lacunae of one or both. We have but to prove that it can be supplied in neither in such a position as would be consistent with a first victory won in 410. Körte himself admits (p. 436) that it is not easy to introduce it into either list, but inclines to restore it in about the last line, i. e., l. 17, of col. I of the Lenaeian list. The last extant name is Eupolis in l. 11. Let us assume, to make the case as favorable as possible to Körte's view, that the name of Aristophanes once stood immediately after that of Eupolis; his first Lenaeian victory was won in 425. There would be left but four lines for the poets who won first victories in the 14 years between. This would give the high average of three and a half years to each poet for this period, as opposed to two and a half from the beginning down to Aristophanes. To bring l. 17 as late as 410 we should have to assume ten second and subsequent victories on the part of poets prior to Lysippus, or, allowing for the two of Eupolis and the (possibly) two of Aristophanes,¹ six other victories for the older poets. This is, of course, possible; but serious difficulties arise when we consider col. II, of which the first twelve names are preserved. If the first victory of Πο- in l. 1 were won after 410, that of the twelfth poet in col. II could not be earlier than 399, allowing for no second victories by the earlier poets in these years; or, taking the average assumed by Körte for the years 425-10, this date would fall *ca.* 380. At the same rate the first Lenaeian victory of Anaxandrides in col. III, which was probably a few years earlier than his first City victory in 378, would fall *ca.* 363. But these are rough calculations. A more certain result is reached if we start with a concrete fact, the Lenaeian victory of Cephisodotus in 402.² Assuming that it was his first

¹ With the *Knights* and possibly the *Wasps*; but the list distinctly favors Philonides as victor in 422.

² Lys. xxi. 4, and *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXI (1900), pp. 50 ff.

victory and that his name was in l. 13 (both assumptions being the most favorable to Körte), in the interval of *seven* years between the earliest possible date for Πο- and Cephisodotus (409-402) there are *eleven* names on the stone. In other words, 415 is the latest possible date for the first victory of the poet in col. I, l. 17! Therefore, if Lysippus won a Lenaeon victory at all, it must have been before 416.

Could he then have been victorious *ἐν ἄσται* in 410? Frag. *i* was in col. I of the original list, and the last name, to be restored Callias, was the fifteenth or sixteenth line.¹ The date of his first victory is known from *IG. II. 971* to have been 446. The first three names in column III are given in *k*: Nicophon, Theopompus, Cephisodotus,² whose dates are here a little later than in the Lenaeon list. Now among the unpublished fragments of this list³ is one which contains portions of twelve names which belong to col. II, i. e., between *i* and *k*. Neither upper nor lower margin is preserved; hence, since the column contained 17 lines, there are lacunae, at the top and bottom of this column, of from one to four lines in extent, to the former of which the one or two lines after Callias should be added. Since Callias' first victory was in 446, the latest possible date for a victory of Lysippus in the lacuna of at most six lines following the former's name would be *ca.* 425.

Our test of Körte's hypothesis, therefore, narrows down to this one question: Could Lysippus have occupied a position in the lacuna of four or less lines at the bottom of col. II on the strength of a victory won in 410 (409)? I am convinced that he could not; but I am obliged to content myself with a single calculation by averages.⁴ Fortunately this happens to be fairly con-

¹ The reasons for these assertions are given in my *Introd. of Com. into the City Dion.*, pp. 24 ff.

² For the classification see *Am. Jour. Phil.* XX (1899). The upper margin of *k* is preserved.

³ Wilhelm announced his discovery of these new fragments in *Jahrb. d. öster. arch. Inst.* I (1898), Beibl., p. 46.

⁴ The demonstration could be made conclusive beyond all reasonable doubt if I were permitted to employ freely the data furnished by the fragment. I trust that I have not ventured too far, nor trenched too much upon the prerogatives of Wilhelm, by using the bare facts. The many scholars who have seen the fragment or copies of it (including, it is to be hoped, the editor of the *Comic Fragments*) will be able to supply from their own knowledge the proofs which I am barred from presenting here.

clusive. The average number of years represented by each poet before Callias is a little over three. If one should apply the same average to the not less than fifteen lines intervening between Callias and the first line in this lacuna, we should reach the year 400 as about the date of the poet whose name stood there. Since most of the six City victories of Cratinus, the four of Eupolis,¹ and the unknown but doubtless large number of Aristophanes and Plato, were won in this period, this average is probably not too high.² At any rate, between the earliest date which can be given to the first line in this lacuna and the year 410 (409) there is a margin which, in my opinion, effectually excludes Lysippus as a victor in 410.

We are accordingly forced to the conclusion that the first victory of Lysippus, if Lenaeon, was won before 416, if Dionysian, between 445 and 425, say about midway between these two dates. In either case that which was won under Theopompus or Glaucippus was not the first, but the second or later. At least one full entry must therefore be inserted in l. 7 before the archon's name. Furthermore, we learn that the second victory was won at the same festival as the one preceding it, since, as we have shown, it can not have been a first victory. Now the fact that he won at least two victories renders it almost certain that they were not Lenaeon.³ I have therefore, without misgivings, assigned them to the Dionysia.

To Körte's 28-32 letters must now be added some 22 more for the additional archon-date and title. Can we determine whether a still greater width is possible? Only by general considerations, but they chance to be satisfactory. If we add another entry to each line the number of plays produced by the poets in these fragments becomes too large to be probable and their distribution among the rank-classes becomes disproportionate. One example will suffice: Anaxandrides, the poet of 1098,

¹Suidas gives a total of 7, the Lenaeon list 3—all won before 410.

²The average for the first 7 of these 15 lines is actually larger; it would have to drop suddenly from 3.5 to 1.7 in the remaining lines to bring the first line of the lacuna to 409.

³I will spare the reader the calculations, which I have given in *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXI (1900), p. 53.

is reported to have brought out 65 plays. Körte's restoration would give him, in addition to his firsts and seconds, nine thirds, one fourth, and four fifths. Since he won ten victories this would leave 41 seconds—a result that dismays Körte and leads him to suspect the tradition that gives 65.¹ By adding two full entries to the line we should have 38 in the last three classes, leaving 10 firsts to only 17 seconds. But by the line which I propose he exhibited 26 plays which were awarded third, fourth, and fifth, leaving 29 seconds and 10 firsts—a reasonable proportion for an eminent poet. There is a second and more important consideration: The addition of two entries would increase the victories of Lysippus to three—too large a number for a poet who, on this hypothesis, produced only six plays. Again, the victor in l. 15 of 1098 would have won three Lenaeon victories; but no poet in the Lenaeon list col. IV is credited with this number except Anaxandrides, whose record precedes, and Nausiocrates, whose first victory was some twelve years later. The assumption of just one entry to the line more than Körte proposes solves all difficulties; the addition of still another would introduce difficulties even greater than are produced by Körte's proposal. I have accordingly adopted the former alternative with confidence.

There can be no doubt that 1098 *a* preceded 1097 with a short interval between. From the victors' lists we gain the names of almost all the poets who won victories in the period between Telecleides and Xenophilus on the one hand and Lysippus on the other. Is it possible to identify the poet whose record preceded that of Lysippus in 1097?

This poet was fairly productive. In these six lines were recorded fifteen exhibitions as follows: γ' City 1 or more, Lenaea 2 (or, Lenaea 3 at least, City unknown), δ' City 8, Lenaea 2; ε' Lenaea 2. The chances are that such a poet won a victory. The dates preserved range from 440–431—a range too narrow for a poet of such productivity. But the competition in 440 was third of that rank, and the date of his first exhibition

¹ This number is by no means incredibly large for a poet whose career extended over something like forty years.

must be advanced several years. We may safely assume for his first appearance *ca.* 445. Now since the position of Telecleides in the Lenaeon list points to a first victory not far from 449, a first appearance somewhat earlier, we see that the interval between the record of Xenophilus and this unknown poet was not considerable. His name may possibly be found in the victors' lists in a position not much later than Telecleides and Xenophilus. A composite list in which the Lenaeon and the City lists are combined, on the basis of such definite dates as are available, would be something like this: Euphronius (C. 458), Ecphantides, Cratinus (C. 452), Diopeithes (C. 451), Crates (C. 450), Xenophilus (L. *ca.* 449), Telecleides (L. *ca.* 447), Callias (C. 446), Aristomenes (L. *ca.* 445), Anonymous, Lysippus (C. *ca.* 435). The order by first appearances would considerably disarrange this list; but since it includes probably all of the new poets who won victories in these twenty years, we may hope to identify the unknown poet as one of these ten.

Do the titles of plays in this poet's record agree with any that are known to us as belonging to any of the poets victorious in this period? In using titles for identification especial stress must be laid upon peculiar or unusual titles. *Plutus* or *Adelphi* would give us the choice of several, but *Pytine* or *Heautontimorumenus* would be practically decisive if the period of their authors were right. So when Körte acutely recognized the titles Στεπποί and Ἡσίοδοι, of a period fixed by the name Xenophilus, his identification of their author as Telecleides was absolutely convincing.

Of the titles remaining in ll. 1-6 the unusual Ὅτρῶα σιδῆρᾶ is not known from other sources, while Σάτυροι was used by at least three poets of the Old Comedy, Ecphantides, Cratinus, and Phrynichus, all of whom are excluded by their periods. A fourth poet of the period must therefore have written a *Satyri*, as Körte also remarks (p. 435). -οις in l. 6 signifies nothing. There remains only Κν- in the first line. No known fifth-century title fits this except *Cyclopes*, attributed to Callias in Suidas, Bekker's *Anec.*, Athenaeus, and Pollux. No other *Cyclopes* is recorded, though Athenaeus in four places assigns

this play to "Callias or Diocles." This can not by any possibility be interpreted to mean that Callias did *not* write a *Cyclopes*—the only matter in which we are immediately concerned—but that Diocles, a poet of unknown date, also wrote one, and that the authorship of the extant play could no longer be determined, though Callias was preferred. Now Callias is one of the three poets between Xenophilus and Lysippus in our composite victors' list, and his first victory in 446 would suit exactly the position in this Roman document occupied by our unknown poet, whose first appearance, as we have seen, must be dated not later than *ca.* 445 but could easily have been several years earlier. As we shall see later, Aristomenes, the next poet after Callias on our composite list, made his first appearance later than Lysippus—a fact that tends to increase the probability that the unknown poet is Callias and not one of the possibly two poets whose names are lost in the lacuna in the City list. Perhaps it can not be claimed that this identification is of mathematical precision, but when we consider that the titles of no other poet of the period offer a single coincidence with any one of the three preserved on the stone, the arguments adduced seem to make the identification extremely probable. We may note about Callias that his name is coupled with that of Cratinus by Athen. i. 22 *c* and with that of Lysippus in Athen. viii. 344 *e*. Pericles, Lampon, Socrates, Malanthias, and Sacas were ridiculed in his most famous play, the *Πεδηταιί*, probably produced *ca.* 432.¹

We now revert to the question whether the record of Lysippus extended from l. 7 to the end of 1097, as Körte (p. 437) contended on the ground that l. 12 afforded no room for a new poet's name—an objection now removed. Körte would assign to Lysippus this remarkable career, which would be made only a little less strange by the additional entry in each line: *α'* Lenaea 410, 404; *β'* Lenaea 394; *γ'* City 435; *δ'* City 439, 432—seven exhibitions in 49 years, a curious distribution of plays (City: 439, 435, 432, 390; Lenaea: 410, 404, 394), and the first victory 29 or 30 years after the first competition!

¹ Bergk's conjecture of Καλλίου for Καλλιάρχου in Athen. xiii. 577 *b* is impossible on account of the date, the archonship of Eucleides.

All this is possible, but exceedingly improbable as an hypothesis—and we must remember that it is nothing more than an hypothesis, to be proved or refuted. But it becomes still less attractive when we realize what an interval must have separated his first exhibition and his last. Lysippus' first appearance must have preceded that of Aristomenes, whose position in the Lenaeon list points to *ca.* 445 for his first victory and to some years before for his first appearance. This would give him an active career of *ca.* 57 years. Are we justified in assuming this? Not unless (1) there is some external evidence in favor of it, or (2) the two titles in ll. 10, 14 are those of known plays by him, or (3) no other poet is known to whom either a career extending from *ca.* 449 to 390 or these titles can better be assigned. In this last case we might prefer to leave in doubt the identity of the poet. As to (1), we have no such reason, for our knowledge of the chronology of Lysippus is limited to what this inscription tells us,¹ except that he ridiculed Lampon, and this fact can take us no later than *ca.* 410.² As to (2), only two titles of Lysippus are known to us from other sources, the *Bacchae* and *Thrysocomus*. As to (3), we do happen to know of a poet whose career extended from *ca.* 447 to 398—Aristomenes, who brought out the *Admetus* against the second *Plutus* of Aristophanes. Here is a career, independently vouched for, of *ca.* 59 years³ and covering the whole of the period claimed for Lysippus without the slightest outside evidence. We have observed that the record of Aristomenes can hardly have preceded that of Lysippus on this stone; but it must have followed after no long interval if the victors' lists teach us anything. These considerations alone raise a presumption in favor of Aristomenes for that part of the record which includes the lowest dates, 394 and 390, i. e., ll. 10 ff. Let us now test this hypothesis by the titles.

¹ So Petersen, who would begin a new poet's list in l. 13.

² If the *Nemesis* is to be attributed to the younger Cratinus, as I believe; see *Harv. Stud.* XV (1904), p. 74.

³ The long career of Aristomenes has long excited comment, even before its beginning could be dated so early. See *Am. Jour. Phil.* XXI (1900), p. 54, where I made the hasty proposal to substitute Aristonymus for Aristomenes in the *Hyp. Plut.* Others have resorted to the theory that there were two comic poets of the name.

The first title is Διονύ-. Aristomenes wrote a play which Athenaeus called simply *Dionysus*, but Pollux by the fuller title Διόνυσος ἀσκητής. But *Dionysus* and its variations could prove little. The second title, however, is unique and therefore of the greatest value for identification, Κολεοφόροις in l. 14. Now under the archon Stratocles (424) Aristomenes was third at the Lenaea, Aristophanes first with the *Knights*, and Cratinus second with the *Satyr*s. The play which Aristomenes produced is reported in the didascalical notice variously, as Ἐλοφόροις in V and as Ὀλοφύροις in Γ, Θ, Ald.¹ The reading of V has in late years been accepted as correct. But when we find on this stone, in a didascalical record corresponding in period covered to Aristomenes, in a category certainly Lenaeian and almost as certainly devoted to exhibitions which won third prize, and finally in the year of an archon whose date may quite well be 424² and the genitive of whose name ends in -ους, the unusual title Κολεοφόροις, palaeographically³ so near the readings which the MSS give for the play with which Aristomenes in the year of Stratocles was third at the Lenaea, the conclusion, as it seems to me, is irresistible that these are not chance coincidences but identical records, and that the poet of this part of the inscription was indeed Aristomenes.⁴

If we approach the study of this inscription with a mind free from preconceptions as to the original length of line, and, fully cognizant of the chances that a series of dates accidentally preserved on a fragment may falsely appear to be a compact original group, refuse to be guided by such coincidences unless supported by external evidence, we shall feel that the indications in favor of Aristomenes are even more convincing than those which have led us to insert in l. 7 a victory of Lysippus prior to that of 410. For some may regard it as remotely possible that the name of Lysippus once stood in the victors' lists for a first victory won in

¹ The earlier editors Ὀλοφυρμοῖς.

² It is the second entry after Morychides, 439.

³ The first source of the error was doubtless due to the initial κ being written like υ.

⁴ The second *Plutus*, we now learn, was produced at the Lenaea; see note on 1097, l. 14.

410. The argument might therefore be made to run, in summary, as follows: Lines 10 ff. must be assigned to Aristomenes, and his name must be inserted in l. 9. The line must therefore have been longer than Körte has assumed by one or more complete entries, and the conditions are better satisfied by the assumption of but one. One victory of Lysippus must accordingly be inserted in l. 7 before that of 410—a result which at once relieves us of the difficulties presented by the victors' lists against the shorter line. This is the course of reasoning, in fact, which first led the writer to abandon the hypothesis of a narrow column, which appeared to him, as to others, to offer the simplest solution (though one not free from grave difficulties) so long as there seemed to be no external evidence which could be brought to bear upon the problem.

For the further details of the writer's conclusions regarding 1097 and the other two fragments reference is made to the reconstruction and accompanying notes. One other matter, however, should be mentioned. I once thought that the poet of the main portion of 1098 was probably Anaxilas, mainly because of the titles 'Ιώ and *Λυπο]ποιός*, Epicrates being introduced into l. 12 as the author of the *'Αντερός*. But Körte's arguments against this have seemed convincing, especially since *Anteros* as a play by Epicrates rests wholly upon a conjecture of Bergk.

In the restoration a line of *ca.* 56 letters has been taken as a fair approximation after a calculation of the average length of the titles and archons in this inscription. With 56 letters, archons and titles of almost exactly the average length can readily be supplied, there being about two letters more to spare in 1098 than in the two others. For the convenience of the reader figures have been inserted in the longer lacunae to indicate the number of letters available for the lost items. It must be borne in mind, however, that the indicated distribution of the space in any line is wholly arbitrary, only the total number of lost letters being even approximately right. But it is believed that at least for the major portion of 1097 and 1098 the general order of the entries and the position of the rank and festival captions may safely be accepted as documentary.

- 1098a Τηλεκλείδης ἐνίκα Λήναια ἐπὶ ca. 449. Five Lenaeon victories.
 ἐν ᾧσται ἐπὶ ca. 440. — — — — δεύτερος (ἐν ᾧσται) — — — — Λήναια — — — —
 1 τρίτος] ἐν ᾧσται ἐπὶ 15 , ἐπὶ 15 , ἐπὶ 15
 2 Εὐμέν[ισιν, ἐπὶ 18 , ἐπὶ 18
 3 π' Α](ψ)εὐδ[ους 9 , ἐπὶ 18 , ἐπὶ 9 κωμω 432
 4 ἰδί]αι Λήναια [ἐπὶ 22 σώωσι, ἐπὶ 12
 5 Στ[ερροῦς ἀν[εδίδασκε, ἐπὶ 16 , ἐπὶ 17
 6 . τέταρτος [ἐν ᾧσται ἐπὶ 23 , ἐπὶ 11
 7 'Ησ[τάδοις σώωσι, ἐπὶ 19 , πέμπτος ἐπὶ 11
 8 . .] ἰώταις. ὁ δεῖνα Β ἐν ᾧσται (?) ἐπὶ 16 ἐπὶ τὴν νίκ-
 9 η]ν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τρι[τα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέταρτα οὐκ ἦλθεν. Ε ἐπὶ 14
 10 Ξερόφιλος [ἐνίκα Λήναια ἐπὶ ca. 450 . . 12 . . ἐπὶ τὰ δεύτερα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ
 11 τ]ρίτα καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ [τέταρτα οὐκ ἦλθεν . Ε etc.

Telecleides, identified by Körte by the titles *Sterroi* and *Hesiodoi*, won first at the Lenaea just after Xenophilus, i. e., ca. 449, as indicated by his position in *IG. II. 977 d*. If he won a City victory it was within a few years after Callias' first in 446.

The Alexandrian pinax Kaib. *C.G.F.* I, p. 10, records 6 plays of Telecleides as extant; 5 are quoted: *Amphiklyones*, *Apseudeis*, *Hesiodoi*, *Prytaneis*, *Sterroi*. The lost plays whose titles were unknown to the compiler, i. e., most of the plays, were entered simply κωμωιδίαι (cf. 1097), and after at least the above five the note σώωσι was added.

1. EIIA copy. Körte also suspects ἐν ᾧσται. As regards the rank-class the possibilities are: a) That the City victories began here. In that case the β' (ἐν ᾧσται) class would begin in, say, 1. 2, Λήναια in 1. 4 being the second section of the β' class. b) That the second section of β' began here, δεύτερος Λήναια preceding. c) The solution preferred here, which has the advantage over the other two of giving a better proportion of exhibitions to victories, viz.: *thirds* City 8, Lenaea 4; *fourths* and *fifths* together 4; *seconds* unknown; *firsts* 5 plus.

2. EYMI copy. Can not be archon. Körte also suggests this restoration.

3. ΠΙΕΥΔ copy. Körte suggests Εὐδήμων, an error for Εὐθύδημον, archon 430. I suspect that the copyist misread the remains of a Ψ ('I') and that we have the archon of 432. 'Αψεύδουσιν would also be possible, but there would hardly be space for σώωσι and the position is better for the archon than for the title.

4. σώωσι is introduced on account of the large amount of space. Of the plays which survived, e. g. 'Αμφικλύουσι, with an archon, e. g. 'Απολλοδώρου, would exactly fill the line.

5. Körte Στ[ερροῦς ἀν[αδίδασκε. I prefer ἀνεδίδασκε on account of 1097, 1. 12. The compiler followed the practice of the official records (cf. *IG. II. 971 c*, 1. 9: παρῃδιδάξαν, i. e. παλαιὸν δρᾶμα). The first production occurred elsewhere in this record as Στ[ερροῖς σώωσι.

6. Might be Lenaeon, the festival name omitted. But the space favors the name.

7. Restoration Körte's. The play was produced ca. 431 (Wilamowitz). If Telecleides reached fifth place πέμπτος is to be introduced; otherwise the festival name. The amount of space indicates some such addition.

8. Στρατιώταις Körte; Νησιώταις?—The generous vacant space after this title indicates a principal division, probably a new poet's record. Further, the comment in the next line could hardly refer to Telecleides. The compiler soon (cf. 1097) began to save space by substituting the signs Β for δεύτερος, Γ for τρίτος, etc.

9. Kaibel surmised the sense to be *nec tertias nec quartas ille umquam tulit*, doubtless correctly. I accordingly suggest the above, which assumes that the poet's record began with a second prize. That of Xenophilus below certainly began with a victory, which suits well the remains of the comment after his name. One would expect ελαβεν with τὴν νίκην, but not with the lower ranks; and the presence of ἐπὶ in both comments is a certain indication of a verb of motion. Körte, who suggests ὦν καὶ ἐπιτατικά without seeing any sense in it, questions the Greek of Kaibel's and my proposal, and perhaps rightly, for I know of no exact parallel. But Thucydides uses ἐπὶ μείζον χωρεῖν (iv. 117) and Sophocles (*Phil.* 259) ἐπὶ μείζον ἐρχεσθαι, which imply also ἐπ' ἐλασσον ἐρχεσθαι. The compiler sought a concise expression which would apply to the low positions as well as to the highest.

10. The approximate date of Xenophilus' single Lenaeon victory is given by his position in *IG. II. 977 d*, ca. 450. He probably did not win at all ἐν ᾧσται. There is no room for a City victory before the comment.

1097	Καλλίας ἐνίκα ἐν ᾧσται ἐπὶ Τιμαρχίδου (446). Two City victories, probably no Lenaeae. B (ἐν ᾧσται) — — — — Ἀθήναια — — — — Γ ἐν ᾧσται — — — —	YEAR
1	ι ἐπὶ Ἀντιοχίδου Κῦ(κλωψιν, Ἀθήναια ἐπὶ ante 434 . . . 16 . . . , ἐπὶ . . . 6 . . .	434
2	. . .]ς κωμωιδίαι, Δ ἐν ᾧσται ἐπὶ ante 441 . . . 20 . . . , ἐπὶ ante . . . 10 . . .	
3	κωμωιδίαι, ἐπὶ Τιμοκλ(έους . . . 10 . . . , ἐπὶ . . . 21 . . . ,	440
4	ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου Σατύροις, [ἐπὶ . . . 19 . . . , ἐπὶ . . . 10 . . . Ὑπ-	437
5	έροις σιδηροῖς, ἐπὶ Πυ(θοδώρου . . . 8 . . . , Ἀθήναια ἐπὶ . . . 9 . . . , Βατρά-	431
6	χ]οις, Ε ἐπὶ Ἀντιοχίδου [. . . 11 . . . , ἐπὶ . . . 24 . . . ,	434
7	. Α]ύσιππος ἐνίκα μὲν [ἐν ᾧσται ἐπὶ ca. 335 . . . 22 . . . , ἐπὶ Γλαυκ-	409
8	ιππου Καταχρήναις, [B δὲ ἐπὶ ca. 447 . . . 18 . . . , ἐπὶ . . . 9 . . . Βά-	
9	κχ]αις, αἷται μόναι σῶδ[αι. Ἀριστομένης ἐνίκα Ἀθήναια ἐπὶ ca. 445 . 11 . .	
10	. , ἐπὶ Διοφάντου Διονύσου ἀσκητῇ, B ἐπὶ ante 390 . . . 23 . . . , ἐ-	394
11	ν ᾧσται ἐπὶ Νικοτέλους [. . . 9 . . . , Γ ἐπὶ ante 440 . . . 18 . . . ἀνεδ-	390
12	δα]ε, ἐπὶ Λυσιστάχου [. . . 12 . . . , Ἀθήναια ἐπὶ ante 439 . . . 18 . . .	435
13	. . .]ι, ἐπὶ Μορυχίδου [. . . 9 . . . , ἐπὶ . . . 17 . . . , ἐπὶ Στρατοκ-	439
14	λεο]υς Κολοφόροις, [ἐπὶ . . . 17 . . . , ἐπὶ . . . 18 . . .	424
	[ἐπὶ Ἀντιπάτρου Ἀδμήτωι].	388

Callias won two City victories (*IG. II. 977 i*, last line as restored in *Am. Jour. Phil. XX*, p. 396, by comparison with *IG. II. 971 f*, col. iii; see my *Introd. of Com. into City Dion.*, p. 24), probably none at the Lenaea. The first City victory is dated exactly. Six titles are quoted: *Aigyptios*, *Atalante*, *Batrachoi*, *Kyklopes*, *Pedetai*, and *Scholazontes*. The majority of his plays were either not preserved or bore no specific titles.

1. The *Cyclopes* was the most quoted of the plays of Callias; see above, p. 213. The mention of ἐν ᾧσται in l. 2 shows that the preceding section was Lenaeae; but since the exhibition under Antiochides l. 6 was Lenaeae, that under the same archon in l. 1 was ἐν ᾧσται. Hence Ἀθήναια must be introduced in l. 1.—*Satyroi*, l. 4, was a common title, employed by five other poets.

5. Title restored by Bergk. Since the competition under Antiochides l. 6 was Lenaeae (see note on l. 1), and the festival is not mentioned in l. 6 after ἐ, it follows that a Lenaeae section under the δ' class preceded. This is the most probable position for the new section.—Between 431 and 425 (*Acharnians*) the number of competitors was reduced from 5 to 3.

7. Lysippus seems to have won no Lenaeae victories (see pp. 209 f. above). Hence the μὲν serves to set off the firsts against the seconds—ἐνίκα μὲν . . . δεύτερος δέ.

8. The archon may be Theopompus, 410. The date of the first entry under β' was that of Lysippus' first appearance and gave him his position in this document after Callias and before Aristomenes. The restoration ἐπὶ Φιλίσκου (447) *Θυρσοκόμοι* would exactly fill the available space. If the *Thyrsokomos* was not here it must have been in the line above, the first City victory.

9. The *Bacchai* is the only play of Lysippus quoted in antiquity.—On the necessity of introducing a new poet here see above, pp. 214 ff. The first Lenaeae victory of Aristomenes is approximately fixed by his position in *IG. II. 997 d*, where two victories are recorded. The known plays of Aristomenes are: *Admetos*, *Boethoi*, *Goetes*, *Dionysos asketes*, *Kolophoroi* (*Hyplophoroi*, *Olophryoi* MSS). We have quotations from all but the first and last.

10. That there is space for the epithet after *Dionysos* tends to confirm Pollux as against Athenaeus; see p. 216. Aristomenes can not have won a City victory, for if ἐν ᾧσται should be inserted here in place of β' there would be a repetition of the festival name in l. 11.

11 ff. The γ' class began in l. 11, for it can not be supplied before Lys. in l. 12 because of the -ε, nor before Morychides l. 13 because ἐν ᾧσται there would repeat the festival name in l. 11; and the sequence 390, 435, and 439 indicates two new chronological series in these lines. Hence the γ' (ἐν ᾧσται) class in l. 11 and the Ἀθήναια section in l. 12. For ἀνέδιδαξε see 1098 a, l. 5. No title or grammarians' comment would explain the -ε, after which an ι can not be restored (Körte, p. 447). The play which the poet reproduced in 440 or before had been brought out only a few years previously, and was doubtless under the lost δ' or ε' classes below.

14. There is no place in ll. 9-13 for a play brought out in 388; hence the *Admetos* was third at the Lenaea. It is also third in Hyp. Aristoph. *Plut.*—confirming the official character of the didascalic notice there given, including the order. Hence the second *Plutus* was brought out at the Lenaea. For *Κολοφόροι*=*Υλοφόροι* MSS, see p. 216. The large proportion of thirds is partly due to the fact that Aristomenes' career covered the whole of the period in which there were but three competitors. He seems generally to have got as low as he could!

1098 'Αναξανδρίδης ἐνίκῃ Λήναια ca. 380. Three Lenaeae victories. ἐν ᾄστει seven victories. B (ἐν ᾄστει) ----- Λήναια -----		YEAR
1] ἐπὶ Χίλωνος Μα[νομένην, ἐπὶ 21 , ἐπὶ . . . 6 . . .	364	
2 . . .]s Διονύσου γονα[ῖς, ἐπὶ 23 , ἐπὶ 10 . . .		
3 . . 'Α]μπρακιδίῳ, Γ' ἐν [ᾄστει ἐπὶ ante 382 24 , ἐπὶ Φανο-		
4 σ[τράτου 'Ερεχθεῖ, ἐπὶ 22 , ἐπὶ 11 'Αχι-	382	
5 λ]λεῖ, ἐπὶ Χαρισάνδρ[ου 9 , Λήναια ἐπὶ ante 374 . . . 17 . . . , ἐπὶ 375		
6 'Ιπ[ποδάμαντος 'Ιοῖ, ἐπὶ 24 , ἐπὶ 11 374		
7 .] 'Οδυσσεῖ, ἐπὶ Κηφισοδ[ώρου . . . 8 , Δ' ἐν ᾄστει ἐπὶ ante 369 . . 16 . . 365		
8 . , ἐπὶ 'Απολλοδώρου 'Αγ[ροκόους, ἐπὶ 23 , ἰὰ 'Ανα-	349	
9 ξίππου Λήναια ἐπ[ὶ ante 368 20 , ἐπὶ ante 367 . . . 16 . .		
10 π]οῖω, ἐπὶ Ναυσικλέου[ς . . . 11 , ἐπὶ 23 367		
11 Ε] ἐν ᾄστει ἐπὶ Χίλωνος [. . . . 15 , ἐπὶ 14 Φαρμακο-	364	
12 μάν]τει ἐπὶ 'Αγαθοκλέ[ους 12 , ἐπὶ 24 356		
13] ἐπὶ Θουδήμου 'Α [. . . 8 . . . , Λήναια ἐπὶ 20 , ἐπὶ 352		
14] ου 'Αντέρωντι, [ἐπὶ 17 , ἐπὶ 17 Φιλ		
15 ἑταιρος ἐ]νίκῃ Λήναι[α ἐπὶ		
16] ι, ἐν ᾄστει[ἐπὶ		
17] ι, ἐπ[ὶ		
18 , ἐπὶ] 'Αρ[ιστοδήμου	351	

Anaxandrides, first recognized here by Böckh, won 10 victories all told (Suidas, of which 3 were Lenaeae (*IG. II. 977 fg*). His first City victory was won in 376 (*Mar. Par.*, l. 82). His position in the Lenaeae list indicates ca. 380 for his first Lenaeae victory. The naming of the festival in l. 3 shows that the Lenaea had been mentioned above; hence the competitions in ll. 1-3 are Lenaeae and β' (i. e., ἐν ᾄστει) followed the victories. Anaxandrides wrote 65 plays (Suidas); ca. 31 were recorded in ll. 1-15. Adding the 10 victories we see that under the β' ἐν ᾄστει section and the lost portion of β' Λήναια were ca. 24 plays, or ca. 29 all told which won second. The record of Anaxandrides thus filled about 30 lines.

2 ff. The titles in ll. 2, 3, and 4 are not elsewhere known to have been used by Anaxandrides.

5 f. A new festival section must have begun between Charisandrus and Hippodamas.

6. An *Io* of Anaxandrides is not known elsewhere; the title was used by Anaxilas.

7. Another Cephisodorus in 357. The mention of the Lenaea in l. 9 shows that an ἐν ᾄστει section under the δ' class had preceded. Since the first entry under δ' ἐν ᾄστει must be earlier than the first under δ' Λήναια, and the latter in turn must be prior to 369, the new class can not be introduced in l. 8. But it might be in l. 6.

11. The only alternative to ε' here is to introduce Ε' (i. e., ἐν ᾄστει) before the last entry in l. 10; but this would give only one play to that section.

12. -τει, ἐν ᾄστει can not be restored unless either the ε' Λήναια section began in l. 11 or a new poet. The more probable solution is that of Wilamowitz, who suggests the title *Pharmakomantis*.

13. The large amount of space suggests that the Lenaeae section under the ε' class began here. This would give 5 City and 4 Lenaeae under ε'.

14. *Anteros* Körte, correcting *Ath. xiv. 654 b* ἐν 'Αντερῶντι accordingly.

15. The poet whose record began here won two Lenaeae victories and at least one ἐν ᾄστει. The only poet in the victors' lists credited with two Lenaeae victories and near Anaxandrides is Philetaerus; Phillipus, two places above Anaxandrides, is a possibility. The only new fact to be gained by an identification is that Philetaerus or Philippus won a City victory; only the list of victors for this period could determine the question.

17. IET copy.

18. The position of the remains would suit an archon's name. But everything in the last three lines must remain purely conjectural.